### AC

The standard is maximizing executive power.

1. Ought is defined as consistency with function. Bad watches aren’t sea-captains.

MacIntyre, Alasdair “After Virtue” Notre Dame University Press: 1981. Pg. 20.

Yet in fact the alleged unrestrictedly general logical principle on which everything is being made to depend is bogus- and the scholastic tag applies only to Aristotelian syllogisms. There are several types of valid arguments in which some element may appear in a conclusion which is not present in the premises. A.N. Prior’s counter-example to this illustrates its breakdown adequately; from the premise ‘He is a sea captain’; the conclusion may be validly inferred that ‘He ought to do whatever a sea-captain ought to do’. This counter-example not only shows that there is no general principle of the type alleged; but it itself shows what is at least a grammatical truth—an ‘is’ premise can on occasion entail an ‘ought’ conclusion. From such factual premises as ‘This watch is grossly inaccurate and irregular in time-keeping’ and ‘This watch is too heavy to carry about comfortably’, the evaluative conclusion validly follows that ‘This is a bad watch’. From such factual premises as ‘He gets a better yield for this crop per acre than any farmer in the district’, ‘He has the most effective programme of soil renewal yet known’ and ‘His dairy herd wins all the first prizes at the agricultural shows’, the evaluative conclusion validly follows that ‘He is a good farmer’. Both of these arguments are valid because of the special character of the concepts of a watch and of a farmer. Such concepts are functional concepts; that is to say, we define both ‘watch’ and ‘farmer’ in terms of purpose of function which a watch or a farmer are characteristically expected to serve. It follows that the concept of a watch cannot be defined independently of the concept of a good watch nor the concept of a farmer independently of that of a good farmer; and that the criterion of something’s being a watch and the criterion of something’s being a good watch.

Good executives wear watches *and* go sailing on yachts. Means it’s most consistent with function. Also, the constitutive nature of executives is to be in power, they are paid and their function is to be in that position.

2. Morality must account for the structure of action because otherwise our actions wouldn’t have structure. This requires overcoming weak people. They just get in the way of things.

Katsafanas Paul (Boston University) “Constitutivism about practical reasons” March 6th 2014 JW 12/31/14

I argue that action has two constitutive aims: (1) agential activity, which I analyze as requiring stable approval of one’s action given complete information about its etiology, and (2) encountering and overcoming resistance to one’s ends. My account begins with a defense of the idea that there is a distinction between actions that spring from our own activity and actions that are brought about in a more passive fashion. Consider the difference between deliberately spurning someone and being led, by unrecognized feelings of anxiety, to avoid someone; arguably, the former case displays a kind of agential activity that is absent in the latter case. This is just one example, but there are many cases of this form.8 Drawing on considerations about the nature of motivation and deliberation, I argue: 1. An agent is active in the production of her action iff (a) the agent approves of her action and (b) further knowledge of the motives figuring in the etiology of this action would not undermine her approval of her action. Employing a roughly Kantian argument about the nature of assuming our freedom from the practical standpoint, I argue that agents are committed to aiming at agential activity in every episode of reflective (or self-conscious) action, and part of what it is to for an action to be reflective is for it to have this aim. It follows that agential activity is the constitutive aim of reflective action. On its own, this aim generates very little normative content. After all, it says nothing about the basis of the agent’s approval of her action. However, I argue that if we investigate the structure of human motivation, we can uncover a second constitutive aim that provides more substance to the theory. Drawing on some insights from Nietzsche’s analyses of human motivation, I argue that each episode of action aims not only at achieving some end, but also at encountering and overcoming obstacles or resistances in the pursuit of this end. For example, I aim not merely at writing this paper, but at writing it in a way that engenders difficulties to overcome. Although initially counterintuitive, I show that this account is supported by empirical and philosophical considerations about the nature of human motivation. In particular, Nietzsche’s account of agency is based on the idea that our actions are motivated by a distinctive kind of psychological state: the drive. Drives admit an aim/object distinction, where the aim is a characteristic form of activity and the object is a chance occasion for expression. For example, the sex drive aims at sexual activity, and might take as its temporary object a particular person. As the drive’s objects are adventitious, there is there is no object the attainment of which completes or satisfies the drive. Rather than disposing us to acquire their objects, then, drives simply lead us to engage in their characteristic form of activity. Elsewhere, I argue that this fact about drives entails that all drive-motivated actions share a common, higher-order aim of encountering and overcoming resistance. For part of what it is to be motivated by a drive—to manifest a drive’s activity—is continuously to seek new objects on which to direct the drive’s activity. In seeking new objects, we seek new resistances. In virtue of being motivated by drives, then, we seek continuous encountering and overcoming of resistance, rather than the attainment of definite states. Nietzsche describes this fact about our aims by saying that we manifest “the will to power.”

3. Everyone should make tons of cash. Cash is key to having fun which is a prerequisite to any moral theory because why even be moral if we’re not having fun??

Plan text: The United States federal government ought to increase the executive minimum wage to $800/hour.

The Onion 03 (America’s Finest News Source) “Congress Raises Executive Minimum Wage To $565.15/Hr” The Onion November 12th 2003 <http://www.theonion.com/articles/congress-raises-executive-minimum-wage-to-56515hr,942/> JW 3/20/15

"This is good news for all Americans who work in the upper levels of commerce," DeLay said. "Almost a third of America's hard-working executives toil at corporations day after day, yet still live below the luxury line. It was about time we gave a boost to the American white-collar worker." The wage was calculated to help executives meet the federal standard-of-easy-living mark of $1.1 million a year. DeLay said that, although his goal is to ultimately reach an executive minimum wage of $800 per hour, he was satisfied with what he characterized as a "stop-gap measure."

The plan is T:

A. chill out-im trying to be reasonable

B. language is disjunctive so who even gives a shit

C. living wage can be whatever you want it to be!

Phillips 13 Brian Phillips (author of Individual Rights and Government Wrongs) “The Fallacy of “Living Wage” Capitalism Magazine March 6th 2013 <http://capitalismmagazine.com/2013/03/the-fallacy-of-living-wage-2/> JW 3/21/15

If the advocates of the “living wage” are truly convinced that arbitrary government dictates have no detrimental consequences on jobs, why don’t they advocate a “prosperity wage”? Instead of legislating a wage that allows families to “get by,” why don’t they legislate a wage that allows families to prosper? In other words, instead of a “living wage” of $10 an hour (or whatever the figure may be), why don’t legislators force businesses to pay $100 an hour? One would think that the answer is obvious, but apparently it isn’t. Few, if any, businesses could afford to pay $100 an hour. They would not create new jobs, and they would likely cut most of the jobs that they currently have. The results would be catastrophic. The difference between a “living wage” and a “prosperity wage” is only one of degree. The principle is the same. A “prosperity wage” would be devastating to jobs. So is a “living wage,” a minimum wage, or any other government mandated wage. The only difference is the number of jobs and lives destroyed.

D. speccing executives is key to education about executives. The impact is education.

E. any other version of the aff means I lose automatically since living wage is unjust.

Burton 13 David Burton (writer from Texas) “Minimum wage makes more per year than our military?! UPDATE: Short answer, yes.” December 10th 2013 HalfTangible <https://halftangible.wordpress.com/2013/12/10/minimum-wage-makes-more-per-year-than-our-military/comment-page-1/> JW 2/20/15

I dunno about you, but I don’t find it fair to demand you get more money than our military for flipping burgers -\_-

F. all knowledge is uncertain. What’s the impact? I don’t know.

Contention one. Being paid minimum wage means you’ll get hit by a car. Be careful!

Clickhole 15 “We Challenged This Man To Survive On Minimum Wage And He Immediately Got Hit By A Car” March 19th 2015 Clickhole <http://www.clickhole.com/article/we-challenged-man-survive-minimum-wage-and-he-imme-2028> JW 3/20/15

With wage inequality in the U.S. continuing to reach new heights, we were curious to see just how feasible it is for low-income Americans to get by in the current economy. So, we challenged Paul Clemons, an ordinary 33-year-old from San Diego, to survive for an entire week on minimum wage in order to understand the struggles faced by millions of hardworking Americans nationwide. Unfortunately, literally seconds into the experiment, he got hit by a car and he died. We set out all the rules, gave Paul his allocated $77 for the week, and prepared to watch the experiment unfold. But moments later, Paul was bleeding out beneath the bumper of a Chevy Cruze. He was on his way to the grocery store with $16.33 in his pocket (the amount he’d budgeted for lunches for the week), and he was hardly 20 feet from his doorstep before our trial came to a sudden end. Technically, we learned that, no, you cannot survive on minimum wage, but this is completely beside the point. A good man is dead now. Suddenly and tragically. Yes, the minimum wage in America almost certainly needs to be raised, but we just weren’t able to prove it in the way we’d hoped. This is very tragic. Paul had just gotten married three months ago. We wish we could say that his death at least made a positive stride toward economic justice in the U.S., but he died before he could prove anything about the minimum wage. Frankly, this is just awful. Our hearts go out to his wife, Sophia. Relatives and friends are invited to pay their respects to Paul Clemons this Saturday, March 14, from 2-6 p.m. at St. Mary’s Parish. In lieu of flowers, donations can be made to the local food bank in Paul’s name.

You can’t be an executive if you get killed in a car crash so this comes first. 10 billion people die every day in car crashes so this comes first under util.

And, death is ontologically the worst possible evil since it destroys the subject. Don’t worry this isn’t a contingent standard, probably.

Paterson Craig Paterson (Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island) “A Life Not Worth Living?” Studies in Christian Ethics <http://sce.sagepub.com> 2003

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81 In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

Contention two. The plan is key to ensuring executives can pay for jets n’ stuff.

The Onion 2 (America’s Finest News Source) “Congress Raises Executive Minimum Wage To $565.15/Hr” The Onion November 12th 2003 <http://www.theonion.com/articles/congress-raises-executive-minimum-wage-to-56515hr,942/> JW 3/20/15

"Many of the thousands of Americans overseeing the nation's factories, restaurant chains, and retailers can't even afford a jet," DeLay said. "It's our long-term goal to ensure that no one who sees to it that others work hard for a living will have to go without the basic necessities of the good life." Under the new law, the executive-minimum salary will increase to more than $1.175 million a year, plus mandatory overtime for executives who work more than seven minutes after 5 p.m., on holidays, outside of their home offices, or from a limousine or non-chartered private aircraft. A separate section of the bill includes concessions for second- and third-housing credits, as well as single-player health-spa coverage. Top executives nationwide have repeatedly called for wage increases in recent years. "Our lifestyles are expensive to maintain," Boeing senior vice-president of international relations Tom Pickering said. "The costs of even the most basic executive transportation, food, and clothing are staggering. Since 1993, the average cost of maintaining a household of six, including a butler, a cook, a maid, a driver, and a groundskeeper, has increased by 14 percent. All this, even after we work our fingers to the bone for hundreds of hours a year, painstakingly assembling our benefits packages. It shouldn't have to be this hard." Some executives called for even more support, in the form of increased benefits and reimbursements. "Well, it's a good start," said Abby Kohnstamm, IBM senior vice-president of marketing. "But I still don't get a transportation allowance for my company-owned limo. And no one has addressed the fact that almost 8 percent of my income disappears after taxes." Nick Scheele, Ford president and chief operating officer, said he looks forward to February 2004, when the wage increase is slated to take effect. "It's about peace of mind," Scheele said. "Executives like myself are sick of living quarterly statement to quarterly statement, forced to check our bank balances before every little real-estate purchase. We're not asking for the world, just the overseas vacations that we so desperately need."

Aviation leadership is key to the economy. STAR THIS CARD.

**Douglass 6** John W., CEO and President of the Aerospace Industries Association of America, in front of Senate Appropriations Committee, www.ieeeusa.org/policy/POLICY/2006/071106b.pdf

**Maintaining U.S. aviation leadership is critical to our nation's economic health. Aerospace provides our nation's largest trade surplus** ($40 billion in 2005**) and employs more than 612,000 workers across the U.S.** We need to recognize the importance of this industry to our national economy by placing renewed emphasis on aeronautics research at NASA.

Econ decline causes extinction.

**Bearden 2k** Lt Col. Beardon, PhD, 2000 http://www.cheniere.org/correspondence/042500%20-%20modified.htm Lt. Col Thomas E. Bearden (retd.) PhD, MS (nuclear engineering), BS (mathematics - minor electronic engineering) Co-inventor - the 2002 Motionless Electromagnetic Generator - a replicated overunity EM generator Listed in Marquis' Who'sWho in America, 2004 The Tom Bearden Website From: Tom Bearden To: (Correspondent) Subj: Zero-Point Energy Date: Original Tue, 25 Apr 2000 12:36:29 -0500 Modified and somewhat updated Dec. 29, 2000

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. **Prior to** the final **economic collapse**, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea {[7]} launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China — whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States — attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, **adversaries** and potential adversaries **are** then **compelled to launch** on **perception of preparations by one's adversary**. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. **Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes** and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, **rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs**. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself {[8]}. **The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere**, at least for many decades.

The impact is 100% probable. Extinction within next 1,000 years.

**RationalWiki 14** RationalWiki. “Doomsday argument” October 6th 2014 <http://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Doomsday_argument> JW 3/9/15

The Doomsday argument applies this to the human race. In the entire history of our species, there have been about one hundred billion humans so far. If the human race were to continue to survive for thousands of years hence, and maintained the current increase in reproduction, the total number of humans would be far greater; on the order of the high trillions or even the quadrillions. This would mean that we are observing humanity in its infancy, which is statistically unlikely. The argument therefore concludes that we're in the "middle" of the human timeline and, extrapolating from current population growth, that timeline will end roughly within the next thousand years.

On the cosmic scale, a thousand years is hella tiny. And accounting for the cosmic scale is key because we’re all just floating through space. What even is life?

And, I got a haircut yesterday. You better compliment me in CX or else you’re making debate unsafe, which is a voter. That’s Teehan 14.

Gee whiz extinction sucks!

Bostrom 01 Nick Bostrom, 2001 prof of Philosophy, Oxford University Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March 2002. First version: 2001 March, JStor

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest[s] an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know—at least not in concrete detail—what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving—and ideally improving—our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.

Our intuition that genocide is wrong requires minimizing existential risks.

**Bostrom 13** Nick Bostrom (Faculty of Philosophy at Oxford). “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy, Vol. 4, Issue 1. 2013. http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.html

We might also consider the issue from a less theoretical standpoint and try to form an evaluation instead by considering analogous cases about which we have definite moral intuitions. Thus, for example, **if we feel** confident **that committing a small genocide is wrong, and that** committing **a large genocide is no less wrong, we might conjecture that committing omnicide is also wrong**. And if we believe we have some moral reason to prevent natural catastrophes that would kill a small number of people, and a stronger moral reason to prevent natural catastrophes that would kill a larger number of people, we might conjecture that **we have a**n even **strong**er **moral reason to prevent catastrophes that would kill the entire human population.**

The role of the ballot is to address the injustice of the Holocaust.

Robinson 7 Jerome Robinson (JEROME ROBINSON IS A TWO DIAMOND SPEECH AND DEBATE COACH CURRENTLY COACHING AT GRANADA HILLS CHARTER HIGH. LD IS HIS SPECIALTY AND HAS HAD SEVERAL CLOSE OUTS DURING HIS TENURE. THIS BLOG ALLOWS HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS HIS VIEWPOINTS AS WELL AS PROVIDE SOME INSIGHT ON WHAT IT TAKES TO WIN IN LD.) “What Exactly Is a Good Turn?” April 1st 2007 Robinson’s Corner http://robinsoncorner.blogspot.com/2007/04/what-exactly-is-good-turn.html

If the Aff did not address the Hitler argument, the Aff would have lost my ballot.

Underview.

1. Denying an assumption of the resolution makes the resolution nonsensical. The King of France wasn’t an executive though so who cares.

2. I defend the resolution as a general principle but I’m willing to specify if you bribe me in CX.

3. Give ONLY THE AFF an RVI. Trust me.

4. The categorical imperative is *too abstract* and fails to address social movements-this must be rejected radically in educational settings to ensure critical pedagogy can liberate the oppressed.

Robinson 7 Jerome Robinson (JEROME ROBINSON IS A TWO DIAMOND SPEECH AND DEBATE COACH CURRENTLY COACHING AT GRANADA HILLS CHARTER HIGH. LD IS HIS SPECIALTY AND HAS HAD SEVERAL CLOSE OUTS DURING HIS TENURE. THIS BLOG ALLOWS HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS HIS VIEWPOINTS AS WELL AS PROVIDE SOME INSIGHT ON WHAT IT TAKES TO WIN IN LD.) “Constructing a Negative Speech” November 1st 2007 Robinson’s Corner http://robinsoncorner.blogspot.com/2007/11/constructing-negative-case.html

Once again we are using the topic: “Resolved: The best form of government is one that is based on Utilitarianism.” My Paramount Value will be Justice defined as giving each his due. My Value Criterion or Standard for the round will be Categorical Comparative where one must be just on both sides. In other words, the means and the ends must be just. I will agree with the Aff’s definitions. Unlike the Aff, this case is at a disadvantage because it’s depicting an ideal that doesn’t exist.

5. Presume aff-statements are ALWAYS true.

Kabay Paul Douglas Kabay, A Defense of Trivialism, 2008

Let us define a trivial entity as an entity that instantiates every predicate, i.e. an entity of which everything is true. One of the things true of a trivial entity is that it exists in a reality in which trivialism is true. Hence, if a trivial entity exists, then trivialism is true. But is it true that there exists a trivial entity? Here is an argument for thinking that it is true: 1) Every being (or entity or object) is either trivial or nontrivial 2) It is not the case that every being is nontrivial 3) Hence, there exists a trivial being. By a nontrivial being I mean a being which instantiates some but not all predicates. Premise 1) exhausts the logical possibilities. But why think that premise 2) is true? The reason why premise 2) is true follows directly from the truth of the PSR (the Principle of Sufficient Reason). According to the PSR “… nothing is, without sufficient reason why it is, rather than not; and why it is thus, rather than otherwise.”108 Or, to put it another way “… **no fact can be true** or existingand no statement truthful **without** a sufficient **reason** for its being soand not different …”109 Alternatively, it has been articulated as “Everything that is the case must have a reason why it is the case. Necessarily, every true proposition or at least every contingent true proposition has an explanation.”110 Now, **if every object were nontrivial**, then **there would be a fact that would be unexplained, specifically the fact of nontriviality**. That is to say, the nontriviality of nontrivial beings would be inexplicable. What I mean here is that **one would need to explain why** only some predicates are instantiated and **not all predicates are instantiated. One could not cite the existence of** another **nontrivial[ism]** being **as the explanation for the nontriviality** of other nontrivial beings, **as this would be** viciously **circular**. Likewise, one could not explain the nontriviality of a given being, B1, byciting the existence of another nontrivial being, B2, whose nontriviality is in turn explained by the existence of another nontrivial being, B3, and so on in [would create] an infinite series of nontrivial beings [as] Now either the infinite series (of nontrivial entities) [which] as a whole is trivial or it is nontrivial. If it is trivial, then there exists a trivial entity. If [the world]it is nontrivial, then the nontriviality of the series as a whole has not been exxplained. But this cannot be so because nontriviality requires an explanation given the truth of the PSR. **It follows then that** the series as a whole is trivial. Therefore,there exists a trivial entity (the series as a whole) and **trivialism is true**. Of course, the only thing that will explain all this nontriviality is a trivial being. **Any explanatory regress will cease** in a satisfactory manner **at the postulating of** a **trivial[ism]** being. Such a being is not one way as opposed to another, that is to say **[as] there is no need to explain why** only **some predicates are true** of it **as opposed to others** – all predicates are true of it. So, for example, it is not trivial as opposed to nontrivial, as its triviality also entails its nontriviality. Moreover, its existence really does explain the existence of nontrivial beings. After all, one of the predicates true of a trivial being is that it exists in a world in which there are nontrivial beings.

6. if the negative reads theory shells they must make me a sandwich. All this talk about fairness is making me hungry.

7. you must concede to my framework. How else are we supposed to get topic education??

8. There’s no such thing as identity. How crazy is that.

Olson Eric T. (Professor of Philosophy at the University of Sheffield) “Personal Identity” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Aug 20, 2002; substantive revision Oct 28, 2010 http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity-personal/#PsyApp

Whatever psychological continuity may amount to, a more serious worry for the Psychological Approach is that you could be psychologically continuous with two past or future people at once. If your cerebrum—the upper part of the brain largely responsible for mental features—were transplanted, the recipient would be psychologically continuous with you by anyone's lights (even if there would also be important psychological differences). The Psychological Approach implies that she would be you. If we destroyed one of your cerebral hemispheres, the resulting being would also be psychologically continuous with you. (Hemispherectomy—even the removal of the left hemisphere, which controls speech—is considered a drastic but acceptable treatment for otherwise-inoperable brain tumors: see Rigterink 1980.) What if we did both at once, destroying one hemisphere and transplanting the other? Then too, the one who got the transplanted hemisphere would be psychologically continuous with you, and according to the Psychological Approach would be you. But now suppose that both hemispheres are transplanted, each into a different empty head. (We needn't pretend, as some authors do, that the hemispheres are exactly alike.) The two recipients—call them Lefty and Righty—will each be psychologically continuous with you. The Psychological Approach as I have stated it implies that any future being who is psychologically continuous with you must be you. It follows that you are Lefty and also that you are Righty. But that cannot be: Lefty and Righty are two, and one thing cannot be numerically identical with two things. Suppose Lefty is hungry at a time when Righty isn't. If you are Lefty, you are hungry at that time. If you are Righty, you aren't. If you are Lefty and Righty, you are both hungry and not hungry at once: a contradiction.

9. If cap is really bad then you should just go shout at Starbucks baristas.

Clickhole 14 Carson Selway (activist) “What I Learned About Capitalism By Walking Into A Starbucks And Screaming ‘Capitalism!’ At The Barista Over And Over Until They Had To Call The Police” June 24th 2014 Clickhole http://www.clickhole.com/blogpost/what-i-learned-about-capitalism-walking-starbucks--364 JW 3/20/15

What happens when someone challenges the largest coffee corporation in the world and the capitalist ideals it represents? I recently learned the answer to that question when I walked into a Starbucks and started loudly screaming the word “capitalism” right into the barista’s face over and over again until she was forced to call the police. The experience opened my eyes to some shocking realities about our society. The truth was harsher and more unpleasant than I ever could have expected. “Please stop, sir,” the barista said after I had been yelling “capitalism” for more than eight minutes straight. “You’re frightening everybody.” In my mind I thought, “Good. They should be frightened. Frightened about the cold, hard truths I’m revealing about their most fundamental beliefs,” but out loud I simply kept screaming “capitalism” even louder than before and I also knocked over a big stack of paper cups. This experience also taught me that when the human cogs that make up the capitalist machine are confronted with a man brave enough to scream “capitalism” over and over again pausing only to breathe every few minutes, they will eventually call the police. Rather than engage in the dialogue I was creating, the barista chose to call 911 and involve the local authorities. Yet even as the police were dragging me out of the Starbucks, I continued to scream “capitalism” again and again, as loudly as I could. The final thing I learned is that when capitalists ban you for life from one specific Starbucks location, you are also banned from all the other Starbucks in the world. The capitalist shills behind this massive corporation may believe they have silenced my voice, but it is my hope that others will take up my cause in my absence. If you want to make a change to the world around you, march into the first Starbucks you find, and begin to scream “capitalism” over and over again. The time for action is now.

10. Reading evidence about how bad income inequality is link turns every piece of offense in the round. Don’t even try it.

Clickhole 14 Jay Krueger (blogger) “After Reading This Graph About Income Inequality, Everything I Thought Was True Isn’t True, Horses Ride Men, And The Rain Falls Up Into The Clouds” Clickhole September 23rd 2014 <http://www.clickhole.com/blogpost/after-reading-graph-about-income-inequality-everyt-892> JW 3/20/15

When I woke up today, I thought I knew roughly how much of a problem income inequality is in America. But then I saw this graph showing just how much the richest 1 percent make, and it shook me to my core so completely that I now realize everything I thought I knew is wrong: The bottom 70 percent of Americans are actually experiencing NEGATIVE growth since the year 2000. Down is really up! The richest 1 percent have tripled their money EVERY year since 2005. Hot is cold! Northwest is southeast! Planes fly underground! Pizza eats people!Before I saw this shocking graph showing the extreme disparity between our nation’s richest and poorest, I would have told you that dogs go bark and cats go meow. But now, with my eyes opened from this stunning graph, I realize cats are the ones who chase tennis balls and dogs are the ones who lay on sunny sofas all day. Tables are for sitting. Chairs are for putting dinner plates on. Hot sauce makes food colder. Ice cubes are spheres of fire. Just look how high that top 1 percent line goes and how low the bottom one is. We should be ashamed to live in a country that allows this to happen. Or rather, we should be excited to die in an ocean that disallows this not to happen. This graph definitively shows how “trickle-down economics” does NOT work. Synonyms are antonyms! Waffles are actually pancakes! Murder is always just! Chrysler Motors wasn’t founded in 1925—it was founded in 5291!

11. The neg may not read cards. That’s key to them fulfilling their role as a lone wolf.

New In Da 2 14 (Probably Ryan Fink) “I cut a card once, it was awful- Interview with a lone wolf” December 13th 2014 <http://newinda2.blogspot.com/2014/12/i-cut-card-once-it-was-awful-interview.html> JW 3/20/15

Wow, you are really strumming my pain with your fingers right now. Why do you think these corporate schools do what they do? Do they have no souls? Are they pure evil? Or do you think they are just smart, hard working students who achieve good results through labor? Hahahahah thanks- I need a good laugh every now and then to put these crushing losses behind me. I mean, I think you are on the right track with that lack of soul thing, but its more than that. It's like these debaters have a hole right through the middle of them, and no matter how much they try to fill that hole with card cutting, practice speeches, watching other peoples outrounds and preparing strategies against them- they just can't fill that hole.

### 1AR Income Inequality Trigger

I warned you about this.

Salles 14 Joaquim Moreira Salles (an intern at ThinkProgress. A native of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, he graduated from Brown University in 2014 where he studied History and Political Science) “The Wealth Gap Between Rich And Poor Is The Widest Ever Recorded” Think Progress December 18th 2014 <http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2014/12/18/3605137/us-wealth-gap-at-its-widest-in-decades/> JW 3/21/15

The wealth disparity between upper and middle income Americans has hit a record high, according to a new Pew Research Center Report. On average, today’s upper-income families are almost seven times wealthier than middle-income ones, compared to 3.4 times wealthier in 1984. When compared to lower income family wealth, upper income family wealth is 70 times larger. It has come to the point where only the top 10 percent of Americans are seeing their wealth grow while the bottom 90 get less and less of the pie each year. The driving force of this wealth chasm are the top 0.1 percent, who have seen their share of the nation’s wealth grow the most over the past decades, from 7 percent in 1979 to 22 percent today. In fact, the top 0.1 percent are now worth more than the entire bottom 90 percent of the U.S. population, according to the report, which adjusts for the shrinking size of the American family so as to enable comparisons across time periods. The study also assesses what effect the 2008 financial crisis had on wealth distribution. Although the crisis wreaked havoc across all income levels, its effects have been much more enduring for those on the lower end of the economic spectrum. Those at the top have managed to recoup their wealth, while middle and lower income families have not made any gains, according to the Pew report. The stock market, on the other hand, has bounced back, surpassing pre-crisis levels, and Wall Street is doing better than ever. The magnitude of wealth inequality in the U.S. reflects a broader trend towards increasingly uneven distribution across the developed world. A recent report by Oxfam shows that the top 1 percent in much of the developed world have also seen their share of national wealth grow significantly over the past 30 years.